HUMAN EVENTS

Vol. XVII, No. 7 Thursday, February 18, 1960 Washington, D. C.

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

News Section

DEFENSE: *Behind the "liberal" attack* .... (page 1)

DEMOCRATS: *Hubert on the rise?* ..... (page 1)

WORLD COURT: *Sovereignty sleighride* .... (page 2)

BANG-JENSEN: *Scent of mystery* ..... (page 4)

REDS: *Youth doesn't want to know* ..... (page 4)

Defense Dogfight: If the "liberal" Democrats really want better national defense in a hurry, they are taking a peculiarly ineffective way of obtaining it. Many at the ringside of the committee hearings and debates about air power and missile production have come to that conclusion, for the following reasons:

(1) The "querulous quartet" (Kennedy, Johnson, Symington and Humphrey) energetically compete with each other for news and camera spots, in assailing alleged laxness of the Eisenhower Administration. Oddly enough, all are ambitious aspirants to oust the Republicans next November. The Capital, while smiling at the spectacle, cannot believe that the country has failed to draw the obvious conclusion—"politics."

Washington agrees with GOP House leader Charlie Halleck: "Apparently a lot of people are more interested in making headlines than headway as far as the defense of our country is concerned."

(2) *The argument that the GOP Administration risks the Nation's security because of Budget-balancing considerations may impress some people out in the country, but not around this politically sophisticated town. The Baltimore* Sun, *an independent Democratic paper which watches Capital doings with a first-class Washington bureau of reporters, last week was moved to exclaim editorially that an "obsession" with balanced Budgets demonstrably has little to do with our defense troubles, if any. "If it is deficits that these candidates [for the Presidency] want," remarks the* Sun, *"then the obvious reply of this Administration is that it has run a deficit for five out of the past seven years, with a $12 billion whopper in fiscal-1959." Washingtonians are well aware that the budgeted expenditures of the past seven years have been the highest in our history, except for those during World War II.*

(3) Obviously, balancing the budget offers no obstacle to bigger and better defense. Elimination of plain and fancy boondoggling and "pork-barrel" would yield plenty of funds, if needed, to expand defense. (HUMAN EVENTS issue of February 4, "How to Save $5.7 Billion," showed what governmental functions should be cut, without affecting the defense expenditures.) With such savings, we could afford missile production expansion, the airborne alert called for by General Power, more Polaris submarines, etc. Yet none of the "liberal" Democratic hopefuls even get close to these facts which stare every Capital observer in the face. The inescapable conclusion is that political hypocrisy marks the mouthings of the "more defense" orators, and that really all they want is "more spending."

(4) Finally, one more suspicious aspect of the mane-waving and finger-shaking barrage impresses old hands on Capitol Hill. Some real statesmen in both parties, while recognizing the sham of much of the current uproar, nevertheless are worried lest the Administration is falling short of doing everything possible to provide adequate defense. Some believe that the Russian menace could be met by an extraordinary effort to speed up missile output, with few additional funds.

The solution mentioned is the naming of a missile czar and a "crash program" for new weaponry, similar to that which—under General Groves—rushed to completion the first atom bomb in World War II.

Over two years ago, when Sputnik appeared, Senator Styles Bridges (R.-N.H.) appealed for such a crash program in an eloquent article in HUMAN EVENTS, on October 19, 1957, and has continued to advocate it ever since. Yet none of the big-spending "liberal" hopefuls has ever demanded the Bridges or any similar "crash" plan. Until they do, suspicion of political motives will continue to becloud the congressional debate about the protection of America.

Rise in Humphrey's Stock: The fourth-runner among the "querulous quartet" has picked up momentum and now is rated as passing "Sanctimonious Stu" Symington, whose recent performances have done him no good. Such is the verdict of the politicos of both parties who have been watching the Democratic nomination horse-race and tapping reports from the hinterland.

Party intelligence from New Mexico, where a Democratic regional conclave met last week in an effort to work up party enthusiasm, relays the word that Senator Humphrey "stole the show." This report contrasts with the front-page clamor about Senator Lyndon Johnson and the Texans' claims that their candidate was going to capture the Western delegates, following his new posture as a "Westerner." Best opinion from those at the New Mexico meeting (covering states having 271 convention votes) was that Johnson did not win strength at the gathering. In fact, Senator Clinton Anderson of that state, himself a Johnson booster, said only one delegate was converted to the Texas Senator's camp.

But Humphrey grabbed the microphone as principal speaker and with his celebrated lung-power inspired a rousing response by—of course—assailing Eisenhower, Nixon and all Republicans. Earl Mazo (biographer of Nixon), who covered the meeting, said, "for the first

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time most Democratic leaders in the West now rank Humphrey as a major contender deserving serious consideration." Senator Kennedy, who also attended, played a lesser role.

Such reports now are altering political appraisals of the picturesque Democratic race, in the eyes of Capitol Hill. Not a few observers are now beginning to admit they have underestimated the Minnesota Senator's possibilities. In addition to the New Mexico show, these observers are weighting Humphrey's chances more heavily because of the latter's rising stock in the upcoming Wisconsin primary fight—a straight-out battle between Kennedy and the Minnesotan. Recently, by party organization finagling, Humphrey won a reapportionment of rural vs. urban delegates which seems likely to help him against the young Massachusetts hopeful.

Many political sleuths say that these circumstances were not merely circumstances, that the powerful and shrewd Walter Reuther strategists are pushing the Minnesotan and the rise of Humphrey is going "according to plan."

Hence, politicos in Washington are beginning to take more seriously the possibility that the Minnesotan may capture the nomination at the Democratic convention. If such a surprise victory should take place, it is believed that a Southern bolt would occur. Already, six Southern states have set up machinery for independent slates of electors, not pledged to the Democratic nominee. More states might join the six. Then a Southern candidate—perhaps Byrd of Virginia—might lead a revolt and could loom as a real "Southern President" possibility. For, if the race between the regular Democratic nominee and the Republican should prove fairly close, conceivably neither would win a clear majority of electoral votes. The upshot—as stated in the Twelfth Amendment to the Constitution—would be that the election would be decided in the House of Representatives, where the Southern candidate might well win. (See "A Southern President?" by John J. Synon in HUMAN EVENTS for August 11, 1958.)

Rockefeller: The image New York Governor Nelson Rockefeller would create regarding his Presidential ambitions—that of the benevolent billionaire bounced by pro-Nixon party bosses—is causing some critical thought in Washington and Albany political circles.

They recall the 1958 race for the New York Republican gubernatorial nomination and the Rockefeller golden steamroller that flattened three highly qualified GOP contenders—Senate Majority Leader Walter J. Mahoney, Assembly Speaker Oswald D. Heck, and former Republican National Chairman Len Hall.

Heck pulled out of the race before the Rochester convention while Mahoney and Hall held on. At the August 25 session Rockefeller was nominated by acclamation, setting the stage for his pizza-chomping whirlwind campaign.

Observers recall that friends close to Hall and Mahoney made no secret of their belief that Nelson used high-pressure influence to steamroll the convention against the two—considered, then as now, more popular than Rocky with New York GOP regulars.

At the time of Rockefeller's nomination the Chicago *Tribune* noted Len Hall's withdrawal prior to Nelson's acclamation victory, editorializing: "Mr. Hall's statement was brief and included little more than the cryptic explanation, 'I have always been a realist in politics.' It was possible but unlikely that Mr. Hall was overwhelmed with evidence of Mr. Rockefeller's popularity with the rank-and file of New York voters. A more probable explanation is that Mr. Hall came to the conclusion that he was competing out of his class . . . . Rockefeller is in a position to finance a statewide campaign without passing the hat outside the family."

Observers note that, in view of the manner in which longtime political friends of Mahoney and Hall were pressured into supporting Rockefeller at the Rochester convention, Nelson's victim-of-the-bosses posture seems a bit out of place.

Latin American Spectrum: For some time observers on Capitol Hill have been urging that the US not continue to tolerate the hostile acts of Red-tainted dictator Fidel Castro while supporting the Cuban sugar industry. Fulton Lewis, Jr., reported last week that Anastas Mikoyan, on his recent trip to Cuba, concluded a deal with Castro which will send 345,000 tons of Cuban sugar to the Soviet Union at 2.98 cents a pound—about half of what the US pays! In addition, Cuba sold 50,000 tons of sugar to Communist Poland last month at 2.93 cents a pound. Interestingly enough, Poland is a sugar-exporting country, having sold 220,000 tons in 1958 while steadily increasing its sugar exports in recent years.

● Congressman H. R. Gross (R.-Iowa) this week offered a measure which would deal with another topic of American concern in Latin America. In the form of an amendment to an appropriations bill, Gross' measure would prohibit Canal Zone funds from being used to erect flagpoles for the display of the Panamanian flag.

Said Gross: "I just don't want the flag of Panama flying over the sovereign territory of the United States."

World Court: "Liberal" efforts to tip-toe up to the Connally Reservation (HUMAN EVENTS, February 11) and blackjack this sovereignty safeguard out of the international law arena have drawn much conservative fire.

Organizations spearheading the drive to enlighten citizens to the danger of scrapping the reservation include the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the National Economic Council. They warn against overconfidence regarding defeat of the Hubert Humphrey-sponsored repeal move, urging all to write their Senators for Connally Reservation retention.

Former American Bar Association President Frank E. Holman, recently pointed out that the World Court was established as a result of the adoption of the United Nations charter in June, 1945. Testifying January 27 before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Holman stated: "It would take a volume, or several, to list all

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the agencies and all the matters involving our domestic matters, which the various agencies of the UN, from 1948 to the present, have proposed to incorporate in some form of treaty and which, as treaty law, would come within the jurisdiction of the World Court, regardless of their domestic character—unless we are protected by the Connally Reservation.

"The great oversight on the part of all those who now advocate withdrawing the Connally Reservation is that they fail to consider the various programs already advanced by the UN and its agencies and the innumerable ones that may be advanced in the future. Through the strategem of treaty law and through other ingenious devices and pronouncements and declarations by Government, a large part of our domestic affairs can be characterized as international. When so characterized, they may easily be treated by the World Court as a part of international law and subject to its compulsory jurisdiction. Under a general and unlimited declaration by the United States accepting the jurisdiction of that Court, we would not be in any posture to prevent it."

The Chicago Scandals: As "the mess in Chicago" grows week by week, the ramifications of the police department and other scandals are leading many who know the Chicago scene to conclude that a sharp upturn in Republican fortunes, both in Chicago and downstate Illinois, is imminent.

The scandals have hit Chicago where the average citizen feels the need for good government directly—in traffic court ticket-fixing, in illegal-parking rackets, in building inspection payoffs, and most of all in police participation in burglary rings. Chicago's police department has long been riddled with political influence, hampering the honest cops in their efforts to do a good day's work for the citizens.

Smoldering resentment against the situation began building up even before the scandals: a HUMAN EVENTS staff member, in Chicago over Christmas, found independents and "liberal" Democrats getting ready to vote against the Democratic city machine in an effort to restore police protection and clean government to the city. (Democratic domination of Chicago reached a peak in last spring's elections when Mayor Richard J. Daley won re-election and the Democrats took 46 of 50 council seats.)

The scandals, however, are hurting Daley's prestige directly: while all observers agree the mayor himself is honest, they also agree that the Democratic machine he runs is not. Now Daley's hand-picked candidate for governor, Otto Kerner, faces a tough fight to win the nomination.

Kerner will also meet stiff opposition from Governor William Stratton or State Senator Hayes Robertson (opposing Stratton in the GOP primary) and could well prove a liability to the Democratic ticket in the general election. Chicago observers recall the 1950 campaign, when a very vulnerable Democratic candidate for Cook County (Chicago) sheriff dragged much of the ticket to defeat with him. Kerner, like Daley, is considered honest, but his Democratic rivals have labelled him as the "machine" candidate, as has Governor Stratton; moreover, downstate Illinoisans are objecting to the Chicago-dominated Democratic slate.

Labor in Miami: The representatives of organized labor were highly incensed last year when Ike suggested they were having a gay time on the "sunny beaches" in San Juan, Puerto Rico. To avoid such criticism, the union leaders have gone elsewhere in 1960—to Miami.

In fact, the high mucky-mucks of the AFL-CIO Executive Council are pondering the plight of the poor working man at the $21.5 million Americana Hotel. Here they are mapping out strategy to raise the wages of the union workers, whose dues and assessments are keeping the leaders in $20-a-day rooms.

The high-priced thinking of labors' big-wigs, who apparently feel this Miami resort will increase their cerebral content, was concentrated on proposals which would stop one union from raiding another's membership.

As of this writing, labor's sun-tanned chieftains have not been able to agree on an arbitration proposal which would let a neutral umpire decide disputes when one union accuses another of member pilfering.

Federal Aid: "Unnecessary and harmful" is the word around Capitol Hill on the $1.8 billion aid-to-education bill passed by the Senate last week. The measure provides funds for both school construction and teachers' salaries. (Earlier, a $2.2 billion proposal was beaten on a tie vote, and Vice President Nixon cast the deciding vote to halt reconsideration of the more expensive plan.)

"Liberals" backing the measure assumed US education problems can be solved with more money. In reality, as Senator Strom Thurmond (D.-S.C.) pointed out during debate, the US already spends more per capita for education than does any other nation, including the Soviet Union—even though the latter includes such "cultural activities" as political rallies and state-owned television stations in its education budget.

And the former Dixiecrat Presidential candidate put his finger on one "harmful" aspect of the bill; the money is granted outright to the states—meaning the state education systems, usually dominated by "life-adjustment" educationists. There is no provision to keep these educationists from spending the funds on driver-training and home economics, or on salaries for teachers of these subjects, rather than for science laboratories and other academic needs.

Answering the naive insistence of the "liberals" that the money could be given to the schools without Federal control, Senator Carl Curtis (R.-Neb.) quoted John J. Tigert, former US Commissioner of Education: "My

STYLES BRIDGES, United States Senator from New Hampshire and Senior Republican Senator: "Unerringly and objectively HUMAN EVENTS analyzes the background behind the news, which to me is more important than the news itself . . . . Not only is HUMAN EVENTS accurate, but it is absolutely fearless in regard to the items and situations which it handles."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

experience in handling Federal subsidies for education has taught me that you must have either Federal control and interference or you must have misappropriation of funds and waste."

Education experts here agree with Senator Barry Goldwater (R.-Ariz.), who summed up the Senate's action thus: "One of the dark days of the Senate's history, when we have once again said to the people of the country that they must rely on the Federal Government."

Bang-Jensen: The open file on the Povl Bang-Jensen case has come in for penetrating analysis by Alice Widener's USA magazine (Box 134, Murray Hill Station, New York). The special article is kicking up no small fuss among UN people and those who would like to see the mysterious matter quietly dropped.

Pinpointing the fallacy current in UN circles and much of the press that Bang-Jensen was "mentally disturbed" at the time of his death by suspected forced suicide in a Bayside Long Island park, Mrs. Widener has come into possession of a memo Bang-Jensen wrote on November 30, 1957. This was less than a week before his UN suspension for refusing to divulge names of Hungarians who testified regarding the 1956 Russian slaughter of Budapest freedom fighters.

Wrote Bang-Jensen: "My wife has . . . insisted that I should inform a few of my friends, that under no circumstances would I commit suicide. I have done so, though reluctantly, since I fear my friends might think I am getting a little dramatic . . . [suicide] would be contrary to my whole nature and to my religious convictions."

Defense Education Act: The Academic World, if it can get its mind off the loyalty oath for a moment, could perhaps make a truly substantive argument against the National Defense Education Act. Is the act, for example, properly educating the students in no-nonsense courses as it was set up to do?

Recalling the arguments that Federal scholarships for students must be given so Americans can one day outsputnik the Russians, HUMAN EVENTS has looked at the official list of the "defense" fellowships offered to some 1500 graduate students and discovered that:

(1) *Five went to students at Indiana University for advanced study in Folklore;*

(2) Two went to students at the University of California for Child Development;

(3) *Five were granted pupils at the University of Wisconsin for studies in Adult Education;*

(4) Five went to up and coming chefs at Cornell University for Home Economics;

(5) *Three were awarded to would-be Michelangelos at Alfred University in Ceramics;*

(6) Five went to prospective teachers at Arizona State University for Guidance;

(7) *Two went to pupils at the University of North Dakota for a more fancy guidance course*: Counseling *and Guidance;*

(8) Three went to dramatic students at Tulane for studies in Theatre;

(9) *Three went to theatre students at the University of Iowa for Dramatic Arts;*

(10) Three went to prospective orators at Ohio University for speech; and merrily it goes.

Thus, does the Commissioner of Education, Lawrence G. Derthick, who has lauded the Soviets for their tough type of education, dispense funds under the Defense Act.

Red Network: While a Communist-controlled group calling itself "Youth Against the House Un-American Activities Committee" was picketing in front of the White House last week, Chairman Francis E. Walter (D.-Pa.) asserted that communism is waging "fourth-dimensional warfare," and stated that the Communist party already detects a shift in American foreign policy "in the direction of a softening. It believes that . . . it can also affect the attitude of the United States Government itself, that there may be a lessening of opposition, exposure, and prosecution of Communists, based on the fear of offending Moscow."

During the hearings before the HUAC which took place last week, the emphasis was placed on the stepped-up campaign by communism to capture the minds of America's young people, with special regard to the recent Seventh Youth Festival in Vienna. The most shocking aspect of the hearings was the reaction of many youths in the audience as daily testimony revealed the tactics used by the Reds at the Youth Festival. As Communist and pro-Communist youngsters arose after offering testimony which consisted of little more than repeated use of the Fifth Amendment, they were met with loud applause, much of which came from students who had come by bus from New York City and Oberlin College in Ohio.

A member of the Oberlin student government told HUMAN EVENTS that the group had come merely to "observe" the hearings, but then admitted that most students had already made up their minds that the Committee was attempting to discredit American youth. When asked whether the Oberlin students who had journeyed to Washington were anti-Communists, he said: "Well, let's just say we're non-Communists."

Communism: The Arthur M. Hyde Foundation, Vantage Point, 287 Highland Street, Milton 86, Massachusetts, is building a library on communism and would be grateful to receive any and all books on the subject.

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First St., S.E., Washington 3, D. C., is a weekly Washington newsletter. Founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section. Second-class postage paid at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1960.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS TO HUMAN EVENTS for new subscribers only: 5 weeks $1. Yearly rate, $11; 6 months, $6; 3 months $3.
By first class mail, $13 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $15 a year. For change of address send old address (EXACTLY AS IT APPEARS on the envelope of your copy of HUMAN EVENTS) and new address (with zone number if any). **ALLOW US TWO WEEKS** to process new subscriptions and change of address.
Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. Only 1955, 1956, 1958 and 1959 volumes available.

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor and Publisher* JAMES L. WICK, *Executive Publisher*
Assistant Editors: JOHN R. BENEDICT, NICHOLAS T. NONNENMACHER, GEORGE O. FOWLER
W. B. HICKS, JR., *Business Manager* FRANK CHODOROV, *Contributing Editor*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 7 HUMAN EVENTS February 18, 1960

THE LIBRARY WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

Article Section I

Semantics vs. The South

How a Censorship Curtain Cloaks Our Cultural Past

By WILLIAM D. WORKMAN, JR.

(This article is an excerpt from a new book, The Case For the South *(Devin-Adair, $5), by William D. Workman, Jr., state capital correspondent for the Charleston (S. C.)* News and Courier*)*

THE SEGREGATION FIGHT is having its effect not only upon the temper and traditions of the Southern people, but upon their speech as well. Each side seeks to bend words to its own use.

The word "Negro" itself now stands as something of an irritant between whites and blacks.

Even well-intentioned Southerners have some difficulty in pronouncing the word in the fashion preferred by Negroes—"knee-grow." Regional speech habits are such that, for the phonetically untrained, it is hard to get full registration of the "knee" in the first syllable, and equally hard to bring out the "r" in the second. The Negro has himself become increasingly sensitive to the "nigger" pronunciation as he has improved his economic, educational, and political status. And although many Negroes still use the term jocularly, familiarly, and sometimes accusingly among themselves, they are more and more resentful of its use by white persons.

The fight against the use of words such as "darkies" began in 1936, when a Negro newspaper, the Baltimore *Afro-American,* started crusading against the Stephen Foster classic, "My Old Kentucky Home," because it used the words "darky" and "darkies." The crusade has not, however, enjoyed the unanimous approval of all Negroes. The outspoken Negro journalist, George S. Schuyler, who has been as prompt to deflate members of his own race as of others, had this to say after the anti-"darky" campaign was initiated by the *Afro-American,* the NAACP, and similar agencies:

"Will someone who has the gift of logic and intelligence tell me what is the difference between darkey and Negro? . . . There can be no more real objection to darkey than there can be to blondie. It is a far more acceptable term than wop or kike. As my friend J. A Rogers (a Negro historian) once profoundly remarked, the difference between Negro and nigger is the difference between sir and sah. Granted that the overwhelming majority of Negroes are opposed to the use of those terms, I can see no point in constantly making a wailing protest against their use."

Yet the Negroes have indeed wailed throughout these past years, and with such intensity that publishers of books and songs, vocalists, and even powerful radio and television networks have capitulated to their demands.

Here is the CBS Television order issued August 2, 1957: "It has always been the policy of CBS Television to change or eliminate words or phrases in songs or program copy that might offend individuals or groups. The implementation of this policy stems from our desire to operate in the public interest and in good taste. This procedure applies to popular as well as traditional songs."

But the alteration of musical lyrics has not stopped with the traditional works such as those by Foster. A revived popular song, "Mississippi Mud," now carries the substitute "people" for "darkies" where the latter word appeared in this version, popular some 25 years ago:

"When the sun goes down and the tide goes out,
The darkies gather 'round and they all begin to shout . . . "

How many other songs of this type have been changed is anyone's guess. It also will be guesswork to determine just how widespread will be the effect of such censorship. Here is one example of how the alteration spread: The 1957 version of the Rotary International songbook omits all references to "darkies" both in Foster's songs and in James Bland's "Carry Me Back to Old Virginny."

SONGS ARE NOT THE ONLY OBJECTS of this compulsion toward racial censorship. Pressure has been brought to bear, with a distressing degree of success, on publishers to make other changes more acceptable to the color-sensitive National Association for the Advancement of Colored (or should it be "non-white"?) People. The venerable child's classic, *Little Black Sambo,* now has become *Little Brave Sambo,* in its more modern and race-conscious version. In the old version, it was banned from the schools of Rochester, N. Y., at the request of local NAACP officials. In 1956, it was barred from the public schools of Toronto, Canada, where a delegation of black, excuse me, brave, parents complained that the book was a cause of anguish to all Negroes.

Not infrequently, the NAACP does itself and the Negro race a thorough disservice by seeking to suppress, revise, or otherwise censor literary or musical works which to it seem objectionable. In September of 1957, for example, the New York City Board of Education dropped Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* from its list of approved textbooks. There was some dispute as to whether the action was motivated by a decision that the book was not properly a textbook, or whether its references to "niggers" was offensive to Negroes. Whatever the primary reason for dropping the book, a spokesman for the NAACP made it clear that the Negro organization strongly objected to the "racial slur" in Twain's works. The fact that Twain's treatment of the Negro was sympathetic and was an effective argument against slavery and racial discrimination seems not to have entered the thinking of the NAACP.

The *Christian Science Monitor* scored the incident editorially in this wise comment:

"All of this is of a piece with the pressures to ban from the radio much-loved Negro dialect songs. Some

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of these, whether evolved from cotton-field chants or written by Stephen Foster, make up a priceless portion of America's none-too-extensive store of folk music.

"Are we to rewrite history, like the Soviets, and deny that the American Negro, however remarkably, has risen from primitive cultures in Africa? Are we to pretend that he always and everywhere has spoken as though he had just stepped out of the University of Chicago or Harvard College?"

The idiocy of the *Huckleberry Finn* incident upset even so pro-integration a newspaper as the New York *Herald Tribune,* which said this editorially: "Anybody who has ever really read *Huck Finn* knows that Jim the Negro comes out far and away the noblest character in the book, far and away superior to any Whites in it . . . . When are our teachers going to be allowed to start teaching and stop being the punching bags of pressure groups?"

Continuation of this censorship trend may soon lead us into the completely neutral world of "Old Afro-American Joe," "Mister Remus" and "Mister Thomas' Cottage."

AT FIRST BLUSH, this business of commercial, literary, and musical censorship seems only the foolish petulance of a hyper-sensitive and inferiority-complexioned racial group which is chagrined over its own characteristic color. On second look, the practice begins to take on a more ominous outlook, something in the nature of the distortions so terrifyingly portrayed in George Orwell's book *Nineteen Eighty-four.*

What frightened Orwell's protagonist could frighten anyone faced with the motto: "Who controls the past controls the future; who controls the present controls the past." His apprehension arose out of this thought:

"If the Party could thrust its hand into the past and say of this or that event, it never happened—that, surely, was more terrifying than mere torture or death . . . ."

That fictional state of affairs may be a far cry from what actually is being done today, but the frame of mind which prompted Orwell's "Party" and that which moves the NAACP today are distressingly alike. If the NAACP finds certain words not to its liking in various songs and books today, and if those words are changed through a massive program of coercive collusion, then will not the next step be to change some of the recorded facts and events of history, such as the existence of slavery, which might be offensive to the NAACP?

One of the most glaring examples of deliberate pro-Negro distortions of the truth occurred in the selection of quotations from Thomas Jefferson for inscription within the Jefferson Memorial at Washington, D. C. One such inscription bears these words:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free."

But that is not the entire quotation, and in that abbreviated form it conveys a meaning quite apart from that intended by Jefferson. Here is the full body of the sentence from which the partial excerpt was lifted:

"Nothing is more certainly written in the book of fate than that these people are to be free; nor is it less certain that the two races, equally free, cannot live in the same government."

A SIGN OF THE TIMES in Northern publications is the tendency to portray all white Southerners as speaking with the broadest and most bucolic of Southern accents, while allowing Negro Southerners to express their thoughts in well-worded, well-phrased, and well-rounded bits of Oxonian English. Take the following as just one example:

William Rotch, editor of *The Cabinet,* of Milford, N. H., was one of the New England editors who visited Mississippi in October of 1956 at that state's invitation. Rotch quotes a white newspaper publisher in this fashion:

"Ah never have, and Ah never will, publish the picture of a niggah in mah paper."

Immediately thereafter, Rotch quotes some of Mississippi's Negro citizens, having them say such things as this:

"We want to educate our people to the importance of voting. My father died several years ago at the age of 67. He was a fine father and a fine man, but he never saw a ballot. To me this seems a terrible thing, and I want my children to know a better life."

(No "Ah" for "I" and no "mah" for "my" when the words come from a black man.)

And Southern dialect, which once sparkled so delightfully in the *Saturday Evening Post* stories of Octavus Roy Cohen and others, has returned to that magazine, but this time out of the mouths of white segregationists rather than Negro protagonists. John Bartlow Martin turned the trick in his 1957 series of articles, "The Deep South Says Never."

To quote James J. Kilpatrick, "all of his Negro sources talk like Oxford dons, while all of the white people talk like Southern white people."

The use of word-weapons may bring a sense of satisfaction and of superiority to those who delight in baiting the South, but they intensify rather than lessen the South's spirit of resistance by so doing. Words can hurt, and all the more so when those whom they wound feel that the hurtful words are unjustified. Southerners, like Scots, have long memories, and what may give a South-baiter a sense of malicious satisfaction today may linger to hamper his cause tomorrow.

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "SEMANTICS VS. THE SOUTH" at $_____

☐ Payment enclosed ☐ Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles, add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription [] 5 weeks for $1 [] 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zone _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XVII, No. 7 HUMAN EVENTS February 18, 1960

Article Section II

Wanted: A More Conservative GOP

WISCONSIN STATE COLLEGE
RIVER FALLS, WISCONSIN

By THE HON. BARRY GOLDWATER
Republican Senator from the State of Arizona

NOT LONG AGO, Senator John Kennedy stated bluntly that the American people had gone soft. I am glad to discover he has finally recognized that governmental policies which create dependent citizens inevitably rob a nation and its people of both moral and physical strength.

If the American people have gone soft, this is a direct result of the perpetual care-policies of those who have spent 25 years substituting governmental subsidies for individual responsibility.

For 25 years, the party whose philosophy Senator Kennedy represents has been saying to the American public: "Don't tackle that job yourself, it's too hard for you, let the Government do it for you."

For 25 years, the apostles of the welfare state have been busy transforming that stern old gentleman in the top hat, the cutaway coat and the red, white and blue trousers, from a symbol of dignity and freedom and justice for all men into a national wet nurse—dispensing a cockeyed kind of patent medicine labeled "Something for Nothing," passing out soothing syrup and rattles and pacifiers in return for grateful votes on election day.

And now, like the over-indulgent guardians who spent the child's inheritance, catering to adolescent whims and desires, they are naively amazed at what their over-indulgence has produced.

We don't strengthen our nation, or build character, by taking the struggle out of life. The people of America know this—even though it may be a new thought for John Kennedy.

If there has been any development of softness in this nation, it has been developed in our leadership. It is expressed in the fuzzy thinking of the master planners of the super-state who would deny to Americans the right to think for themselves, to face their own responsibilities, to win their own personal victories, and to justify by their own efforts the space they occupy on this earth.

Life was not meant to be easy. The American people are adult—eager to hear the bold, blunt truth, weary of being kept in a state of perpetual adolescence—like so many children, too young to be told the facts of life.

The truth is: the American people have never failed when freedom has been challenged. And what hangs in the balance today? Not just this or that political party, not just this or that system of government, or economic system or social organization—what is at stake in the mid-years of this century, what we will nobly preserve or meanly lose, are the dearest persuasions of 6,000 years of history. What is at stake is love, honor, justice, truth and man's understanding of his relationship to Almighty God. These are the component parts of freedom.

It is true the Democrat Party is suffering from a schizophrenic disorder. The left-wing innovators who have been in control of the Democrat administrations since 1933 have nothing but contempt for the conservative element of their party. And their continuing success at the polls has infected the thinking of too many Republicans.

This nation has always been a conservative nation. The radical ideas of Europe gained no supporters in this land of freedom and opportunity. Dwight Eisenhower was elected on a conservative platform in 1952 because the American people were eager for a return to those governmental principles and practices which have survived the buffeting of chance and the testing of time.

Abraham Lincoln chose to be called conservative—one who would conserve and protect the best of the past and apply the wisdom of the ages to the problems of the future.

A TRUE CONSERVATIVE recognizes that the present generation is a party to a living contract between those who have died to make man's progress possible and those generations yet unborn. And a party to such a contract knows that change and innovation and tinkering, just for the sake of change, can be disastrous.

In 1912 three candidates running for the Presidency vied with each other to be the most conservative. There is today, in our nation and throughout the world, a gradual reawakening of understanding, a return to the conservative beliefs which always have and always will provide the greatest benefit for the greatest number by creating a climate of maximum opportunity with a minimum of governmental interference, taxation and dictation.

Today, the popular outcry is to say: "Well, there's really not much difference between the Republican and the Democrat principles."

Let me confess that we do have some welfare staters in our party on our side of the aisle. And we have, at times, offered candidates and policies which were little more than hollow echoes of the siren songs of the welfare staters; and when we have fallen from grace, the American public has made it abundantly clear that we were in error.

If the Republican Party is to lead this nation forward to a restoration of freedom, to progress and to a better tomorrow, we must once again become the Republican Party. We must be ourselves. We must reassert that it is not only impossible to out-promise the big giveaways of the welfare staters, but morally wrong and evil and destructive of freedom.

During the days of the great depression, that master propagandist of the New Deal, Charlie Michaelson,

Published weekly at 408 First Street, S.E., Washington 3, D. C. • Copyright 1960 by HUMAN EVENTS

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

spent most of his time developing the image of the Republican Party as evil and selfish, indifferent to misfortune—dull, unimaginative, entrenched in greed.

I would suggest: now is the time for the Republican Party to throw off this mantle of hatred and smear, this description devised to deceive.

Republicans around this great nation of ours have been telling me we can win the elections of 1960—they tell me we will win if we thrust aside timidity, plant our flag squarely on those conservative principles which made this nation great and speak forthrightly to the American public.

The Republicans of this nation, and many of my friends in the Democrat Party, have warned me that if we temporize, if we compromise, if we go along with the proponents of pyramiding big government, we shall certainly be defeated.

Let us then, as the 1960 elections draw nearer, present a Republican Party united in courage. Integrity demands that we catalogue and denounce those devices which have created dependency, penalized individual initiative and thrift, and given birth to the sprawling octopus of bureaucratic interference.

Let us boldly repeat Grover Cleveland's statement: that it is the "duty of the people to cheerfully support the government; it is not the duty of the government to support the people."

Let us offer to the American voter a clear-cut choice between the proponents of the paternalistic super-state with its ever-increasing spending and its ever-increasing taxation and its ever-increasing interference in the life of the individual—and the Republican Party as a vehicle through which the people can reassert their sovereignty over government.

LET US PROCLAIM our determination to divest the federal establishment from all of those expensive non-productive activities which are an expression of the mushrooming of bureaucracy. And just in case we have forgotten some of these activities, may I enumerate them:

The Federal Government is the greatest land owner. Its holdings comprise 472 million acres—representing one-fourth of the acreage of the 48 states, exclusive of Alaska and Hawaii.

The Federal Government is the greatest property manager. It owns and operates two and a half billion square feet of floor space.

The Government is the greatest renter. Its lease property, at home and abroad, amounts to almost 2½ million acres and includes 94½ million square feet of floor space in buildings. And for these facilities, you and I pay an annual rent bill of more than $107 million.

Government is the biggest restaurant operator and clothier. It spends almost $1.3 billion in these operations —and so on, and so on, in a list that is long and frightening.

Although all of these programs of the welfare staters are in fact, an assault upon the dignity of the individual —designed to rob him of his independence, lessen his ability and his will to be self-sufficient, limit his opportunity, guide and determine his course in this world, Senator John Kennedy expresses surprise and dismay when he discovers that some of the people of America have developed a tendency to go soft.

We cannot end all unnecessary or expensive governmental operations overnight. But we can make a start—the kind of start the Republican Congress and the Republican administration made when it reduced the Federal Budget for fiscal 1955 to $64 billion.

I can hear the cries of anguish now from some quarters in our own party. We will be told it will be unpopular to reduce federal aids and giveaways. We will be told the American people are so dependent upon Federal aid they can't survive without it.

Let's take a look at what happened in last year's session of Congress. At the opening of this Congress, we were told the majority of the Senate and the majority of the House were owned by the labor unions. At the beginning of last year the odds makers would have given you a one-hundred-to-one bet against the passage of any truly effective labor legislation to correct the evils exposed by the McClellan Committee.

You know the history. You know that the first bill passed the Senate in a weak and ineffective form, that the House was considering three bills. Then what happened—the President of the United States spoke directly and forthrightly to the people of America, and the people of America spoke to their representatives with courage and determination. Subsequently, a strong and beneficial labor bill was passed and signed into law.

With this demonstration of courage and understanding on the part of the people squarely before us, can we be faint-hearted? On what authority do these voices who tell us the American people are timid mendicants, dependent upon federal subsidy, speak?

Do you recall the words of George Washington when he spoke to the Constitutional Convention in one of its blackest hours? Let me recall them to you:

"If to please the people we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we, afterward, defend our work. Let us raise a standard to which the wise and honest can repair. The event is in the hands of God."

HUMAN EVENTS was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is published at 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D.C., and reports from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article. $11 per year.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS, new subscribers only: 5 weeks for $1.

ORDER BLANK

HUMAN EVENTS, 408 First Street, SE, Washington 3, D. C.

Send me _____ reprints of "WANTED: A MORE CONSERVATIVE GOP" at $_____

[] Payment enclosed [] Bill me

Additional copies of this 2-page article: single copy 15c (coins not stamps); 15 copies $1; 35 copies $2; 125 copies $5; 300 copies $10; 1,000 copies $20. In 5,000 lots $15 per thousand. Unless otherwise ordered, reprints are sent by fourth-class mail, which takes ten days to two weeks for delivery. For first-class mail delivery of 2-page articles add ½c per copy; for airmail, add 1c per copy.

Enter my subscription ☐ 5 weeks for $1 ☐ 1 year for $11

Name _____

Street _____

City _____ Zon _____ State _____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED